



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,494	11/06/2003	Jac-Won Lee	033808-006	7628
21839 7590 10/26/2007 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER SIEDLER, DOROTHY S	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com  
debra.hawkins@bipc.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/701,494	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Dorothy Sarah Siedler	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-27-07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment filed August 6, 2007. Claims 1-9 are pending, with claims 1-4 and 7 amended.

#### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed August 6, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that, "neither Nagai nor Kishinsky teaches or suggests 'a main control module for controlling an action of the CTI control module in accordance with a predetermined interpretation scenario that defines basic telephone actions to be executed at a next state in response to events generated at a current state' (Remarks page 9 and 12), as well as that, "Nowhere does Nagai teach that the system execution management program 317 manages execution of the program group in accordance with a predetermined interpretation scenario" (Remarks page 10). However the examiner respectfully disagrees. **Nagai** discloses that the system execution management program, having detected a call (predetermined interpretation scenario and the current state), starts the contact manager program, which uses the IVR program to induce the logging in program or service change program (next state) (column 18 lines 15-32).

Applicant also argues that, "Nagai des not define an event, which is generated in response to a button signal input through the CTI board to control the CTI board as a job unit comprising CTI control functions for performing a basic telephone action, as recited in claim 1" (Remarks page 11), as well as that, "neither Nagai nor Kishinsky

Art Unit: 2626

teaches or suggests 'an interpretation transmission step of controlling the CTI board in accordance with the interpretation scenario and transmitting the translated voice to the other party in accordance with the interpretation scenario, wherein the predetermined interpretation scenario defines basic telephone actions to be executed at a next state in response to events generated at a current state'" (Remarks page 12). However the examiner respectfully disagrees. **Nagai** discloses that user input through the keypad is used to designate a menu selection (basic telephone action). The contact manager program then uses the IVR program to provide a guided message to the user (column 18 lines 36-50). **Nagai** also discloses that the system recognizes an incoming voice with the ASR processing board then uses a program stored in memory to perform language translation (interpretation scenario); the translation is determined based on the requested media type at the receiver which was previously registered and stored in memory (column 8 lines 62-67 and column 9 lines 14-15).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Nagai** (6,636,587).

As per claim 1, **Nagai** discloses a third-party call control type simultaneous interpretation system, comprising:

a CTI (Computer-Telephony Integration) board for establishing a traffic channel between a talker and a listener (column 6 lines 52-57);

a CTI control module for generating an event in response to a button signal input through the CTI board to control the CTI board as a job unit comprising CTI control functions for performing a basic telephone action (column 18 lines 36-50, *user input from the keypad is accepted as the designation of a menu selection*);

an interpretation module for recognizing a voice of the talker/listener input through the CTI board and translating the voice into a predetermined language (column 8 lines 62-67 and column 9 lines 14-15, *the system recognizes an incoming voice with ASR processing board, then uses a program stored in memory to perform language translation*);

and a main control module for controlling an action of the CTI control module in accordance with a predetermined interpretation scenario that defines basic telephone actions to be executed at a next state in response to events generated at a current state (column 18 lines 25-312).

As per claim 4, **Nagai** discloses the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the interpretation module comprises a speech recognition section for recognizing the voice input through the CTI board and converting the recognized voice into text (column 8 lines 62-67 and Figure 3 item 308);

a translation section for translating the text into the predetermined language (column 9 lines 14-15);

and a speech synthesis section for synthesizing a speech from the text recognized through the speech recognition section or the text translated through the translation section and outputting the synthesized speech (column 8 lines 59-61).

As per claim 5, **Nagai** discloses the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the interpretation scenario includes a current state conversion action selected according to a current state and the event generated in the CTI control module, and basic telephone actions (column 20 lines 59-65, *the system determines the necessary media conversion, during a telephone call for example, based on the current media type and the requested media type at the receiver*).

As per claim 6, **Nagai** discloses the system as claimed in claim 5, wherein the main control module includes an interpretation scenario management section for

selecting the current state conversion action and the basic telephone action on the basis of the predetermined interpretation scenario when the event is generated in the CTI control module, and a state conversion section for converting the current state into the next state in response to the current state conversion action selected from the interpretation scenario management section (column 20 lines 59-65 and column 18 lines 15-55, *the system determines the necessary media conversion, during a telephone call for example, based on the current media type and the requested media type at the receiver, the requested media type at the receiver registered previously and saved in memory*).

As per claim 7, **Nagai** discloses a third-party call control type simultaneous interpretation method, comprising the steps of:

a telephone connection step of establishing a traffic channel between a talker and a listener when the talker connects with a simultaneous interpretation system (column 6 lines 52-57);

an automatic interpretation step of, when an event is generated in a CTI control module in response to a button signal input by the talker or listener through a CTI board to control the CTI board as a job unit comprising CTI control functions for performing a basic telephone function, translating an input voice of the talker or listener into a predetermined language in response to the generated event based on a predetermined interpretation scenario, and an interpretation transmission step of controlling the CTI

board in accordance with the interpretation scenario and transmitting the translated voice to the other party in accordance with the interpretation scenario, wherein the predetermined interpretation scenario defines basic telephone actions to be executed at a next state in response to events generated at a current state (column 18 lines 36-50, *user input from the keypad is accepted as the designation of a menu selection*, and column 8 lines 62-67 and column 9 lines 14-15, *the system recognizes an incoming voice with ASR processing board then uses a program stored in memory to perform language translation, the translation determined based on the requested media type at the receiver which was previously registered and stored in memory*).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,3,8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Nagai*** in view of ***Kishinsky*** (6,286,033).

As per claim 2, ***Nagai*** discloses the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the CTI control module comprises an event handler for generating the event in response to the button signal input through the CTI board (column 18 line 63 – column 19 line 65



and column 17 lines 19-21, *the system routes a message from a source to a receiver using various contact means, including a telephone, through the PBX, or telephone switchboard. Since a user indicates the number to be called, i.e. the receiver, by pushing buttons on the telephone, it is inherent that a button is pushed*);

and a working section for calling the CTI control functions in a given order from the CTI API and performing the basic telephone action in accordance with the main control module (column 9 lines 32-33 and Figure 3 item 317, *the system execution management program control the operation of the operation of sub-programs in the CTI server*).

However **Nagai** does not explicitly disclose a CTI API (Application Programming Interface) including CTI control functions for the CTI board. **Kishinsky** discloses a system for computer-integrated telephony (CTI) that uses an application-programming interface (column 4 lines 38-39) as an interface between the software and the platform. **Kishinsky** discloses the distribution of CTI scripts between telecommunications centers, including telephone call processing and switching centers, and is therefore analogous art.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an API as an interface between the application software and the application platform in **Nagai**, since API's are known as reliable interfaces with ready made software available, thus removing the need to spend resources and time developing a new one.

As per claim 3, **Nagai** in view of **Kishinsky** discloses the system as claimed in claim 2, and **Nagai** further<sup>(n)</sup> discloses wherein the basic telephone action includes one or more of phone dialing (column 18 lines 14-15), phone answering, phone disconnection or hanging up, button pressing (column 18 lines 39-41), button reading, tone detection, voice forward, voice store, speaking and listening.

As per claim 8, **Nagai** discloses the method as claimed in claim 7, wherein the automatic interpretation step comprises: recognizing the voice and translating the recognized voice into the predetermined language through an interpretation module in accordance with the predetermined interpretation scenario (column 8 lines 62-67 and column 9 lines 14-15, *the system recognizes an incoming voice with ASR processing board then uses a program stored in memory to perform language translation, the translation determined based on the requested media type at the receiver which was previously registered and stored in memory*).

**Nagai** does not explicitly disclose recording the input voice of the talker or listener in response to the event based on the predetermined interpretation scenario when the event is generated in the CTI control module in response to the button signal input by the talker or listener through the CTI board. However, **Nagai** does disclose that a groupware control program collects information, such as sender address, telephone number etc., and saves it in the work memory (column 19 lines 19-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to record the user or talkers voice in response to an event in **Nagai**, sine it would enable the system to store vocal input for future processing, preventing the loss of vocal input information when the system cannot process the input in real time.

As per claim 9, **Nagai** in view of **Kishinsky** discloses the method as claimed in claim 9, and **Nagai** further discloses wherein the translating step comprises: recognizing the recorded voice and converting the recognized voice into text (column 8 lines 62-67); translating the text into the predetermined language (column 9 lines 14-15); and synthesizing a speech from the translated text (column 8 lines 59-61).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dorothy Sarah Siedler whose telephone number is 571-270-1067. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DSS



TĀLIVALDIS IVĀRS ŠMITS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER